

Roger L Belfay
Attorney at Law

dispensing device **BELOW** the sanitary surface provided in the invention of Oates '513. Applicant's claim one includes as one of its elements "A dispensing device to supply said sanitary covering material **with said dispensing device disposed above said frame**, attached to said first side of said frame, and outside of said sanitary area". Because the sanitary surface of the present invention is contained within the area bounded by the frame, the dispensing device of the present invention is disposed **above** the sanitary surface, while the drawings and disclosures of Oates teach placement of the dispensing device **below** the sanitary surface. This difference provides the present invention with a significant an advantage over the invention of Oates.

2. While Steiner '610 teaches "This web of sheeting is stretched upwardly against the end of the table top ...". This is a clear teaching that the sheet and its dispenser is below the sanitary surface provided by the invention of Steiner '610. Applicant's claim one includes as one of its elements "A dispensing device to supply said sanitary covering material **with said dispensing device disposed above said frame**, attached to said first side of said frame, and outside of said sanitary area". The placement of the dispensing device below the sanitary surface renders in Steiner renders the invention of Steiner unusable upon a floor. This difference provides the present invention with a significant an advantage over the invention of Steiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103: We respectfully disagree with your rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 103 as being "**unpatentable over Oats '513 in view of Kapilof '003 (US Publication 2003/0116003)**" and request that you withdraw this rejection for the following reasons, which are repeated from our previous response:

- 1) Applicant reiterates the above reasons why Oats '513 does not anticipate applicant's claim one and asserts that without one or both of these elements present in Oats '513 it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art to apply the sensor of Kapilof '003 to modify Oates' to create the invention of applicant's claim 8.

829 Tuscarora Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Telephone: 651-222-2782
e-mail: rogerbelfay@rogerbelfay.com

Roger L Belfay

Attorney at Law

- 2) The sensor disclosed by Kapilof '003 exclusively senses conditions related to the roll of material such as position of said material or forces exerted upon said material, while the sensor of the present invention employs **"Motion, infrared, laser, or weight sensors ... to detect dismount of each user"**. This difference enables the present invention to **"cause automatic collection of the sanitary covering material and preparation of a newly sanitized surface for the next user"** without user intervention other than progressing away from the invention.

Response to Arguments: In the examiner's "Response to Arguments" it is admitted that in the invention of Oates '513 "The sanitary area includes the upper portion of mattress 160 above sheet 150' as shown in figure 1 and 1A". Review of these figures in the Oates' '513 reference reveals that the sanitary area is disposed above the dispensing means. While in the present invention the sanitary area is disposed below the dispensing means. This difference makes the present invention suitable for use on a floor by minimizing the difference in elevation between the overall area of the floor and the sanitary area provided. This difference makes the present invention suitable for use in such operations as airport security screening of feet and footwear of prospective passengers.

Sincerely,



Roger L. Belfay
Registered Patent Attorney
Registration No. 51449

Enclosures:

1. Clean Copy of amended claim set
2. Clean Copy of amended detailed description
3. Mark up of amended claim set
4. Mark up of amended detailed description